

EXHIBIT A

SUMMONS
(CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:
(AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

THE PGA TOUR, a Maryland corporation; and DOES 1-50; inclusive,

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:
(LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

RYAN LEBEUF, an individual;

ENDORSED

SUM-100

FILED
FOR COURT USE ONLY
JULY 1, 2018 (JULIO 1 DE LA CORTE)

MAR 01 2018 P 4:38

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
M. CARRERA, DEPUTY

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form. If you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. **AVISO!** Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación.

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. **AVISO:** Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is:
(El nombre y dirección de la corte es): **ALAMEDA SUPERIOR COURT**
1225 Fallon Street
Oakland, California 94612

CASE NUMBER:
(Número del Caso):

RG18895113

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:
(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):
Joseph M. Lovretovich; Mythily Sivarajah 21052 Oxnard St. Woodland Hills, CA 91367 (818) 610-8800

DATE:
(Fecha)

MAR 01 2018

Chad Finkle

Clerk, by
(Secretario)

Maria Carrera

Deputy
(Adjunto)

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)
(Para prueba de entrega de esta citación use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)).

[SEAL]

NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

1. ☐ as an individual defendant.
2. ☐ as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):

3. ☒ on behalf of (specify):

under: ☒ CCP 416.10 (corporation)

☐ CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation)

☐ CCP 416.40 (association or partnership)

☐ other (specify):

4. ☐ by personal delivery on (date):

☐ CCP 416.60 (minor)

☐ CCP 416.70 (conservatee)

☐ CCP 416.90 (authorized person)

The PGA Tour, a Maryland Corporation

CM-010

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): Joseph M. Lovretovich; Mythily Sivarajah 73403; 252494 JML LAW, APLC 21052 Oxnard Street Woodland Hills, CA 91367 TELEPHONE NO.: (818) 610-8800 FAX NO.: (818) 610-3030 ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff		FOR COURT USE ONLY ENDORSED FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY MAR - 1 2018 CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT By <u>Maria Carrera</u> MARIA CARRERA, Deputy	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA STREET ADDRESS: 1225 Fallon Street MAILING ADDRESS: 1225 Fallon Street CITY AND ZIP CODE: Oakland, California 94612 BRANCH NAME: René C. Davidson Courthouse			
CASE NAME: LEBEUF v THE PGA TOUR-SF			
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unlimited (Amount demanded exceeds \$25,000) <input type="checkbox"/> Limited (Amount demanded is \$25,000 or less)		Complex Case Designation <input type="checkbox"/> Counter <input type="checkbox"/> Joinder Filed with first appearance by defendant (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	
		CASE NUMBER: RG18895113	
		JUDGE: DEPT:	

Items 1-6 below must be completed (see instructions on page 2).

1. Check one box below for the case type that best describes this case:
- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| Auto Tort
<input type="checkbox"/> Auto (22)
<input type="checkbox"/> Uninsured motorist (46)
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort
<input type="checkbox"/> Asbestos (04)
<input type="checkbox"/> Product liability (24)
<input type="checkbox"/> Medical malpractice (45)
<input type="checkbox"/> Other PI/PD/WD (23)
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort
<input type="checkbox"/> Business tort/unfair business practices (07)
<input type="checkbox"/> Civil rights (08)
<input type="checkbox"/> Defamation (13)
<input type="checkbox"/> Fraud (16)
<input type="checkbox"/> Intellectual property (19)
<input type="checkbox"/> Professional negligence (25)
<input type="checkbox"/> Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)
Employment
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wrongful termination (36)
<input type="checkbox"/> Other employment (15) | Contract
<input type="checkbox"/> Breach of contract/warranty (06)
<input type="checkbox"/> Rule 3.740 collections (09)
<input type="checkbox"/> Other collections (09)
<input type="checkbox"/> Insurance coverage (18)
<input type="checkbox"/> Other contract (37)
Real Property
<input type="checkbox"/> Eminent domain/inverse condemnation (14)
<input type="checkbox"/> Wrongful eviction (33)
<input type="checkbox"/> Other real property (26)
Unlawful Detainer
<input type="checkbox"/> Commercial (31)
<input type="checkbox"/> Residential (32)
<input type="checkbox"/> Drugs (38)
Judicial Review
<input type="checkbox"/> Asset forfeiture (05)
<input type="checkbox"/> Petition re: arbitration award (11)
<input type="checkbox"/> Writ of mandate (02)
<input type="checkbox"/> Other judicial review (39) | Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation
(Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.403)
<input type="checkbox"/> Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)
<input type="checkbox"/> Construction defect (10)
<input type="checkbox"/> Mass tort (40)
<input type="checkbox"/> Securities litigation (28)
<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental/Toxic tort (30)
<input type="checkbox"/> Insurance coverage claims arising from the above-listed provisionally complex case types (41)
Enforcement of Judgment
<input type="checkbox"/> Enforcement of judgment (20)
Miscellaneous Civil Complaint
<input type="checkbox"/> RICO (27)
<input type="checkbox"/> Other complaint (not specified above) (42)
Miscellaneous Civil Petition
<input type="checkbox"/> Partnership and corporate governance (21)
<input type="checkbox"/> Other petition (not specified above) (43) |
|--|--|---|
2. This case ☐ is ☒ is not complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the factors requiring exceptional judicial management:
- | | |
|--|--|
| a. <input type="checkbox"/> Large number of separately represented parties
b. <input type="checkbox"/> Extensive motion practice raising difficult or novel issues that will be time-consuming to resolve
c. <input type="checkbox"/> Substantial amount of documentary evidence | d. <input type="checkbox"/> Large number of witnesses
e. <input type="checkbox"/> Coordination with related actions pending in one or more courts in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court
f. <input type="checkbox"/> Substantial postjudgment judicial supervision |
|--|--|
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a. ☒ monetary b. ☒ nonmonetary; declaratory or injunctive relief c. ☒ punitive
4. Number of causes of action (specify): 15
5. This case ☐ is ☒ is not a class action suit.
6. If there are any known related cases, file and serve a notice of related case. (You may use form CM-015.)

Date: 3/1/2018

Joseph Lovretovich; Mythily Sivarajah

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

(SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)

NOTICE

- Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the first paper filed in the action or proceeding (except small claims cases or cases filed under the Probate Code, Family Code, or Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result in sanctions.
- File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule.
- If this case is complex under rule 3.400 at seq. of the California Rules of Court, you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all other parties to the action or proceeding.
- Unless this is a collections case under rule 3.740 or a complex case, this cover sheet will be used for statistical purposes only.

Page 1 of 2

BY FAX

Superior Court of California, County of Alameda



Notice of Assignment of Judge for All Purposes

Case Number: RG18895113
Case Title: Lebeuf VS The PGA Tour
Date of Filing: 03/01/2018

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

Pursuant to Rule 3.734 of the California Rules of Court and Title 3 Chapter 2 of the Local Rules of the Superior Court of California, County of Alameda, this action is hereby assigned by the Presiding Judge for all purposes to:

Judge:	Michael M. Markman
Department:	16
Address:	Administration Building 1221 Oak Street Oakland CA 94612
Phone Number:	(510) 267-6932
Fax Number:	
Email Address:	Dept16@alameda.courts.ca.gov

Under direct calendaring, this case is assigned to a single judge for all purposes including trial.

Please note: In this case, any challenge pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 170.6 must be exercised within the time period provided by law. (See Code Civ. Proc. §§ 170.6, subd. (a)(2) and 1013.)

NOTICE OF NONAVAILABILITY OF COURT REPORTERS: Effective June 4, 2012, the court will not provide a court reporter for civil law and motion hearings, any other hearing or trial in civil departments, or any afternoon hearing in Department 201 (probate). Parties may arrange and pay for the attendance of a certified shorthand reporter. In limited jurisdiction cases, parties may request electronic recording.

Amended Local Rule 3.95 states: "Except as otherwise required by law, in general civil case and probate departments, the services of an official court reporter are not normally available. For civil trials, each party must serve and file a statement before the trial date indicating whether the party requests the presence of an official court reporter."

IT IS THE DUTY OF EACH PLAINTIFF AND CROSS COMPLAINANT TO SERVE A COPY OF THIS NOTICE IN ACCORDANCE WITH LOCAL RULES.

General Procedures

Following assignment of a civil case to a specific department, all pleadings, papers, forms, documents and writings can be submitted for filing at either Civil Clerk's Office, located at the René C. Davidson Courthouse, Room 109, 1225 Fallon Street, Oakland, California, 94612, and the Hayward Hall of Justice, 24405 Amador Street, Hayward, California, 94544. All documents, with the exception of the original summons and the original civil complaint, shall have clearly typed on the face page of each document, under the case number, the following:

ASSIGNED FOR ALL PURPOSES TO
JUDGE Michael M. Markman
DEPARTMENT 16

All parties are expected to know and comply with the Local Rules of this Court, which are available on the Court's website at: [http://www.alameda.courts.ca.gov/Pages.aspx/Local-Rules\(1\)](http://www.alameda.courts.ca.gov/Pages.aspx/Local-Rules(1)) and with the California Rules of Court, which are available at www.courtinfo.ca.gov.

Parties must meet and confer to discuss the effective use of mediation or other alternative dispute processes (ADR) prior to the Initial Case Management Conference. The court encourages parties to file a "Stipulation to Attend ADR and Delay Initial Case Management Conference for 90 Days". Plaintiff received that form in the ADR information package at the time the complaint was filed. The court's Web site also contains this form and other ADR information. If the parties do not stipulate to attend ADR, the parties must be prepared to discuss referral to ADR at the Initial Case Management Conference.

Courtesy copies of all law and motion papers filed with the Court are to be delivered directly to Department 16.

Tentative rulings for case management conferences can be viewed in the Register of Actions. The tentative ruling will become the order of the court if there is no appearance by any party. Any party submitting to a tentative ruling should contact all other parties before not appearing.

Schedule for Department 16

The following scheduling information is subject to change at any time, without notice. Please contact the department at the phone number or email address noted above if you have questions.

- Trials generally are held: Trials commence with Pretrial Conferences held Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Trials are generally held Monday through Thursday from 9:30 a.m. to 12 p.m. and 1:30 p.m. to 4:20 p.m.
- Case Management Conferences are held: Initial Case Management Conferences: Monday through Thursday at 9:00 a.m. Case Management Conference Continuances: Monday through Thursday at 9:00 a.m.
- Law and Motion matters are heard: Tuesday at 9:00 a.m. and Friday at 9:00 a.m. Reservations are required
- Settlement Conferences are heard: When specially set by the department.
- Ex Parte matters are heard: Monday through Thursday at 9:00 a.m. Reservations are required.

Law and Motion Procedures

To obtain a hearing date for a Law and Motion or ex parte matter, parties must contact the department as follows:

- Motion Reservations
Email: Dept16@alameda.courts.ca.gov
- Ex Parte Matters
Email: Dept16@alameda.courts.ca.gov

Tentative Rulings

The court may issue tentative rulings in accordance with the Local Rules. Tentative rulings will become the Court's order unless contested in accordance with the Local Rules. Tentative rulings will be available at:

- Website: www.alameda.courts.ca.gov/domainweb, Calendar Information for Dept. 16
- Phone: 1-866-223-2244

Dated: 03/02/2018


Fec 2/18/18

Presiding Judge,
Superior Court of California, County of Alameda

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that the following is true and correct: I am the clerk of the above-named court and not a party to this cause. I served this Notice by placing copies in envelopes addressed as shown on the attached Notice of Initial Case Management Conference and then by sealing and placing them for collection, stamping or metering with prepaid postage, and mailing on the date stated below, in the United States mail at Alameda County, California, following standard court practices.

Executed on 03/05/2018

By


digital

Deputy Clerk

JML LAW, A Professional Law Corporation
 Attn: Lovretovich, Joseph M.
 21052 Oxnard Street
 Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Superior Court of California, County of Alameda

Lebeuf

Plaintiff/Petitioner(s)

VS.

The PGA Tour

Defendant/Respondent(s)

(Abbreviated Title)

No. RG18895113

**NOTICE OF CASE MANAGEMENT
 CONFERENCE AND ORDER**
 Unlimited Jurisdiction

TO ALL PARTIES AND TO THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

Notice is given that a Case Management Conference has been scheduled as follows:

Date: 07/16/2018 Time: 09:00 AM	Department: 16 Location: Administration Building Third Floor 1221 Oak Street, Oakland CA 94612 Internet: www.alameda.courts.ca.gov	Judge: Michael M. Markman Clerk: Ana Liza Tumonong Clerk telephone: (510) 267-6932 E-mail: Dept16@alameda.courts.ca.gov Fax:
------------------------------------	---	---

ORDERS

1. Plaintiff must:

- a. Serve all named defendants and file proofs of service on those defendants with the court within 60 days of the filing of the complaint (Cal. Rules of Court, 3.110(b)); and
- b. Give notice of this conference to all other parties and file proof of service.

2. Defendant must respond as stated on the summons.

3. All parties who have appeared before the date of the conference must:

- a. Meet and confer, in person or by telephone as required by Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.724;
- b. File and serve a completed *Case Management Statement* on Form CM-110 at least 15 days before the Case Management Conference (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.725); and
- c. Post jury fees as required by Code of Civil Procedure section 631.

4. If you do not follow the orders above, the court may issue an order to show cause why you should not be sanctioned under Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2.30. Sanctions may include monetary sanctions, striking pleadings or dismissal of the action.

5. You are further ordered to appear in person or through your attorney of record at the Case Management Conference noticed above. You must be thoroughly familiar with the case and fully authorized to proceed. You may be able to appear at Case Management Conferences by telephone. Contact CourtCall, an independent vendor, at least three business days before the scheduled conference. Call 1-888-882-6878, or fax a service request to (888) 882-2946. The vendor charges for this service.

6. You may file *Case Management Conference Statements* by E-Delivery. Submit them directly to the E-Delivery Fax Number (510) 267-5732. No fee is charged for this service. For further information, go to www.alameda.courts.ca.gov/ff.

7. The judge may place a *Tentative Case Management Order* in your case's on-line register of actions before the conference. This order may establish a discovery schedule, set a trial date or refer the case to Alternate Dispute Resolution, such as mediation or arbitration. Check the website of each assigned department for procedures regarding tentative case management orders at www.alameda.courts.ca.gov/dc.

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that the following is true and correct: I am the clerk of the above-named court and not a party to this cause. I served this Notice of Hearing by placing copies in envelopes addressed as shown hereon and then by sealing and placing them for collection, stamping or metering with prepaid postage, and mailing on the date stated below, in the United States mail at Alameda County, California, following standard court practices.

Executed on 03/05/2018.

By

^{digital}
J. Agame

Deputy Clerk



Superior Court of California, County of Alameda Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Information Packet

The person who files a civil lawsuit (plaintiff) must include the ADR Information Packet with the complaint when serving the defendant. Cross complainants must serve the ADR Information Packet on any new parties named to the action.

The Court *strongly encourages* the parties to use some form of ADR before proceeding to trial. You may choose ADR by:

- Indicating your preference on Case Management Form CM-110;
- Filing the Stipulation to ADR and Delay Initial Case Management Conference for 90 Days (a local form included with the information packet); or
- Agree to ADR at your Initial Case Management Conference.

QUESTIONS? Call (510) 891-6055. Email adrprogram@alameda.courts.ca.gov
Or visit the court's website at <http://www.alameda.courts.ca.gov/adr>

What Are The Advantages Of Using ADR?

- *Faster* – Litigation can take years to complete but ADR usually takes weeks or months.
- *Cheaper* – Parties can save on attorneys' fees and litigation costs.
- *More control and flexibility* – Parties choose the ADR process appropriate for their case.
- *Cooperative and less stressful* – In mediation, parties cooperate to find a mutually agreeable resolution.
- *Preserve Relationships* – A mediator can help you effectively communicate your interests and point of view to the other side. This is an important benefit when you want to preserve a relationship.

What Is The Disadvantage Of Using ADR?

- *You may go to court anyway* – If you cannot resolve your dispute using ADR, you may still have to spend time and money resolving your lawsuit through the courts.

What ADR Options Are Available?

- *Mediation* – A neutral person (mediator) helps the parties communicate, clarify facts, identify legal issues, explore settlement options, and agree on a solution that is acceptable to all sides.
 - **Court Mediation Program:** Mediators do not charge fees for the first two hours of mediation. If parties need more time, they must pay the mediator's regular fees.

Some mediators ask for a deposit before mediation starts which is subject to a refund for unused time.

- **Private Mediation:** This is mediation where the parties pay the mediator's regular fees and may choose a mediator outside the court's panel.
- **Arbitration** – A neutral person (arbitrator) hears arguments and evidence from each side and then decides the outcome of the dispute. Arbitration is less formal than a trial and the rules of evidence are often relaxed. Arbitration is effective when the parties want someone other than themselves to decide the outcome.
- **Judicial Arbitration Program (non-binding):** The judge can refer a case or the parties can agree to use judicial arbitration. The parties select an arbitrator from a list provided by the court. If the parties cannot agree on an arbitrator, one will be assigned by the court. There is no fee for the arbitrator. The arbitrator must send the decision (award of the arbitrator) to the court. The parties have the right to reject the award and proceed to trial.
- **Private Arbitration (binding and non-binding)** occurs when parties involved in a dispute either agree or are contractually obligated. This option takes place outside of the courts and is normally binding meaning the arbitrator's decision is final.

Mediation Service Programs In Alameda County

Low cost mediation services are available through non-profit community organizations. Trained volunteer mediators provide these services. Contact the following organizations for more information:

SEEDS Community Resolution Center

2530 San Pablo Avenue, Suite A, Berkeley, CA 94702-1612

Telephone: (510) 548-2377 Website: www.seedscrc.org

Their mission is to provide mediation, facilitation, training and education programs in our diverse communities – Services that Encourage Effective Dialogue and Solution-making.

Center for Community Dispute Settlement

291 McLeod Street, Livermore, CA 94550

Telephone: (925) 373-1035 Website: www.trivalleymediation.com

CCDS provides services in the Tri-Valley area for all of Alameda County.

For Victim/Offender Restorative Justice Services

Catholic Charities of the East Bay: Oakland

433 Jefferson Street, Oakland, CA 94607

Telephone: (510) 768-3100 Website: www.cceb.org

Mediation sessions involve the youth, victim, and family members work toward a mutually agreeable restitution agreement.

ALA ADR-001

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address) TELEPHONE NO.: _____ FAX NO. (Optional): _____ E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): _____ ATTORNEY FOR (Name): _____	FOR COURT USE ONLY
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, ALAMEDA COUNTY STREET ADDRESS: _____ MAILING ADDRESS: _____ CITY AND ZIP CODE: _____ BRANCH NAME: _____	
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: _____ DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: _____	
STIPULATION TO ATTEND ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION (ADR) AND DELAY INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE FOR 90 DAYS	CASE NUMBER: _____

INSTRUCTIONS: All applicable boxes must be checked, and the specified information must be provided.

This stipulation is effective when:

- All parties have signed and filed this stipulation with the Case Management Conference Statement at least 15 days before the initial case management conference.
- A copy of this stipulation has been received by the ADR Program Administrator, 1225 Fallon Street, Oakland, CA 94612.

1. Date complaint filed: _____ An Initial Case Management Conference is scheduled for:

Date: _____ Time: _____ Department: _____

2. Counsel and all parties certify they have met and conferred and have selected the following ADR process (check one):

- ☐ Court mediation ☐ Judicial arbitration
☐ Private mediation ☐ Private arbitration

3. All parties agree to complete ADR within 90 days and certify that:

- a. No party to the case has requested a complex civil litigation determination hearing;
- b. All parties have been served and intend to submit to the jurisdiction of the court;
- c. All parties have agreed to a specific plan for sufficient discovery to make the ADR process meaningful;
- d. Copies of this stipulation and self-addressed stamped envelopes are provided for returning endorsed filed stamped copies to counsel and all parties;
- e. Case management statements are submitted with this stipulation;
- f. All parties will attend ADR conferences; and,
- g. The court will not allow more than 90 days to complete ADR.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: _____

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)



(SIGNATURE OF PLAINTIFF)

Date: _____

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)



(SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF)

ALA ADR-001

PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT:	CASE NUMBER.:
--	---------------

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

▶ _____
(SIGNATURE OF DEFENDANT)

Date:

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

▶ _____
(SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT)

JML LAW
A Professional Law Corporation
21052 Oxnard Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 610-8800

JML LAW
A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION
21052 OXNARD STREET
WOODLAND HILLS, CALIFORNIA 91367
Tel: (818) 610-8800
Fax: (818) 610-3030

JOSEPH M. LOVRETOVICH, STATE BAR NO. 73403
MYTHILY SIVARAJAH, STATE BAR NO. 252494

Attorneys for Plaintiff
RYAN LEBEUF

ENDORSED
FILED
ALAMEDA COUNTY

MAR 01 2018 P 4:38

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
M. CARRERA, DEPUTY

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA- OAKLAND RENE C. DAVIDSON
COURTHOUSE

RYAN LEBEUF, an individual;
Plaintiff

vs.

THE PGA TOUR, a Maryland
corporation; and DOES 1-50; inclusive,
Defendants.

Case No.: **RG 18895113**
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF:

1. Disability and Sexual Orientation Discrimination (Gov. Code § 12940(a));
2. Failure to Make a Reasonable Accommodation (Gov. Code § 12940(m));
3. Failure to Engage in Interactive Process (Gov. Code § 12940(n));
4. Retaliation (Gov. Code § 12940(h));
5. Failure to Prevent Discrimination and Retaliation (Gov. Code § 12940(k));
6. Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy;
7. Fraudulent Inducement to Move (Lab. Code § 970);
8. Promissory Fraud;
9. Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses (Lab. Code § 2802);
10. Failure to Pay Overtime (Lab. Code § 510);
11. Failure to Provide Meal Breaks (Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512);
12. Failure to Provide Rest Breaks (Lab. Code § 226.7);
13. Failure to Provide Timely and Accurate Wage Statements (Lab. Code § 226);
14. Failure to Pay Wages (Lab. Code §§ 201, 202, 203 & 204); and
15. Violations of Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

BY FAX

JML LAW
A Professional Law Corporation
21052 Oxnard Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 610-8800

1 Plaintiff, RYAN LEBEUF, hereby brings his complaint against the above-named
2 Defendants and states and alleges as follows:

3 **THE PARTIES**

4 1. Plaintiff RYAN LEBEUF ("Mr. LEBEUF" or "PLAINTIFF") is an individual
5 residing in the County of Essex, New Jersey. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Mr.
6 LEBEUF resided in the States of California and Florida.

7 2. Upon information and belief, PLAINTIFF alleges that at all relevant times herein
8 mentioned, Defendant THE PGA TOUR, INC. ("DEFENDANT" or "THE PGA") was, and is, a
9 Maryland corporation with doing business in Pleasanton and Hayward, California.

10 3. Mr. LEBEUF is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant
11 named in this action, including the Doe Defendants, at all relevant times were the agents,
12 ostensible agents, servants, employees, representatives, assistants and/or co-conspirators of each
13 of the other Defendants and were at all times acting at least in part within the course and scope of
14 his, her, or its authority as agents, ostensible agents, servants, employees, representatives and/or
15 associates, with the authorization, consent, permission or ratification of each of the other
16 Defendants.

17 4. Defendants THE PGA and DOES 1 through 50 are collectively referred to as
18 "DEFENDANTS." Hereinafter in the Complaint, unless otherwise specified, reference to a
19 Defendant or Defendants shall refer to all DEFENDANTS, and each of them.

20 **GENERAL AND BACKGROUND ALLEGATIONS**

21 5. From on or about October 31, 2016 until March 3, 2017, Mr. LEBEUF was an
22 employee of THE PGA and Does 1 through 50 in Pleasanton and Oakland, California.

23 6. The acts and omissions of DEFENDANTS alleged herein, except as otherwise
24 noted, occurred in the County of Alameda, State of California.

25 7. Mr. LEBEUF is a gay man with a disability and/or perceived disability of anxiety
26 and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder ("ADHD").

27 8. In August 2016, Mr. LEBEUF applied for a position with THE PGA while he was
28 residing in Jacksonville, Florida.

JML LAW
A Professional Law Corporation
21052 Oxnard Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 610-8800

1 9. On or about October 20, 2016, THE PGA through Trish Gregovich, Rich
2 Vecchio, human resource representative and Michele Corse, offered Mr. LEBEUF employment
3 as a Sales Manager, in the Web.com Tour – TBA department, provided that he relocate to the
4 San Francisco bay area. He was assured in that same conversation that he will be provided time
5 to transition and find a home office by January or early 2017. Ms. Corse also informed Mr.
6 LEBEUF that he would receive tuition reimbursement to continue his Master's program through
7 THE PGA's tuition reimbursement program.

8 10. On or about October 25, 2016, Mr. LEBEUF discussed with Ms. Gregovich
9 revisions to the initial offer, including but not limited to seeking reimbursement for moving
10 expenses. Ms. Gregovich once again reaffirmed that given the difficulties of finding a home
11 office in the bay area that THE PGA would pay for his hotel, help him through the process of
12 finding a home office and reassured him that he would have time until January 2017 to find a
13 home office.

14 11. In or about October 27, 2016, Ms. Gregovich requested Mr. LEBEUF to fly to the
15 bay area. On that same date, Dan Glod, President of the Web.com Tour, communicated with Mr.
16 LEBEUF, expressing his desire for Mr. LEBEUF to join THE PGA and assuring Mr. LEBEUF
17 that THE PGA will allow him time to move and transition by January 2017. Mr. Glod informed
18 Mr. LEBEUF that until he can find a place, Mr. LEBEUF would work remotely from Florida
19 near Mr. Glod's office.

20 12. By October 31, 2016, as additional and further inducements THE PGA's
21 employees, including Ms. Gregovich, Mr. Vecchio, Mr. Glod and Ms. Corse offered the
22 following benefits: to have his hotel expenses in the San Francisco bay area paid by THE PGA
23 while Mr. LEBEUF looked for housing in the bay area, relocation allowance of \$2,000, to work
24 primarily from a home office in the bay area while visiting the Hayward location of THE PGA
25 and after sixty (60) days of employment with THE PGA for tuition reimbursement to pursue his
26 masters degree.

27 13. On or about October 31, 2016, during Mr. LEBEUF's visit to the bay area in
28 Pleasanton, THE PGA confirmed in writing some of the terms of the offer of employment,

JML LAW
A Professional Law Corporation
21052 Oxnard Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 610-8800

1 including but not limited to Mr. LEBEUF's base pay of \$52,000 annually, his classification as an
2 exempt employee who was ineligible for overtime, an outline of his commissions' compensation
3 and payment of up to \$2,000 in relocation expenses.

4 14. On or about November 7, 2016, Mr. LEBEUF commenced his employment with
5 THE PGA, and underwent orientation at THE PGA headquarters in Ponte Vedra Beach, Florida.
6 During this orientation, Mr. LEBEUF's job duties were further clarified by THE PGA.

7 15. On or about November 10, 2016, Mr. Glod and Ms. Gregovich instructed Mr.
8 LEBEUF to move to the bay area immediately and promised that THE PGA would pay for his
9 hotel accommodations until he found a home office by January 2017.

10 16. On or about November 16, 2016, Mr. LEBEUF, based upon the assurances and
11 representations of THE PGA, left Jacksonville, spent more than \$7,000 on moving expenses,
12 ended his education with the University of North Florida and moved himself to Alameda County
13 where he was informed he would be working out of a home office.

14 17. On or about November 17, 2016, Ms. Gregovich instructed Mr. LEBEUF to stay
15 at a hotel that she had secured for him for about six weeks through the end of December 2016.

16 18. On or about November 18, 2016, Ms. Gregovich required Mr. LEBEUF to pay
17 THE PGA a portion of the hotel expenses of about \$1,500. Mr. LEBEUF reluctantly paid said
18 amount as he had already commenced his move from Florida to California.

19 19. On or about November 22, 2016, Mr. LEBEUF began working for THE PGA in
20 Pleasanton, California at the Ellie Mae Corporate Headquarters, the presenting sponsor of the
21 Ellie Mae Classic. His office consisted of a cubicle in the office kitchen of THE PGA's sponsor,
22 Ellie Mae, where he was instructed to make phone calls while people constantly walked and
23 conversed right next to him. Ms. Gregovich specifically informed Mr. LEBEUF that he needed
24 to be at the Ellie Mae Corporate Headquarters in the Pleasanton office from 8 am to 5:30 pm
25 everyday.

26 20. At all times during his employment, Mr. LEBEUF was paid a salary and
27 commissions and erroneously classified as an exempt employee even though he did not qualify
28 for any exemption under federal or California law.

JML LAW
A Professional Law Corporation
21052 Oxnard Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 610-8800

21. Mr. LEBEUF did not qualify under the inside salesperson exemption because his commission were not at least 50% of his total compensation during each representative period of his employment with DEFENDANTS.

22. Mr. LEBEUF did not qualify for the outside salesperson exemption because he worked more than 50% of his time from his employer's place of business and not his home office.

23. As a result of the misclassification of Mr. LEBEUF, DEFENDANTS failed to pay him any wages for overtime hours worked, and failed to authorize and permit him to take meal and rest periods. DEFENDANTS also failed to have a written, actively-enforced policy of providing meal and rest periods to Mr. LEBEUF.

24. Throughout his employment, Mr. LEBEUF worked more than eight (8) hours in a day and/or forty (40) hours in a week. In fact, Mr. LEBEUF routinely worked over seventy (70) hours per week. At no time did THE PGA pay Mr. LEBEUF for any overtime hours worked despite the fact that Mr. LEBEUF was not exempt from the overtime pay requirements as stated in the California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

25. Throughout his employment, Mr. LEBEUF was routinely not permitted to take his thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal break within the first five (5) hours of work and/or uninterrupted ten (10) minute rest period breaks after every four (4) hours of work or major fraction thereof, despite Mr. LEBEUF consistently working over eight (8) hours in a workday.

26. Throughout his employment, THE PGA also failed to provide Mr. LEBEUF with itemized and accurate wage statements. His wage statements do not list the actual hours he worked.

27. In or around December 2016, when Mr. LEBEUF inquired about commencing his master's program, Ms. Gregovich informed him not to pursue his master's program at that time, given his forthcoming work responsibilities and duties. Pursuant to Ms. Gregovich's instruction, Mr. LEBEUF, therefore, did not continue his master's program.

28. On or around December 5, 2016, on a trip to Las Vegas for THE PGA's winter meetings, Mr. LEBEUF's supervisor, Ms. Gregovich made a comment about how "gay people"s

JML LAW
A Professional Law Corporation
21052 Oxnard Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 610-8800

1 presence on “Grindr” makes it “trashy.” When Mr. LEBEUF challenged this comment, she
2 reaffirmed that “gay people” being “trashy.” During this same conversation, Ms. Gregovich
3 expressed that she was surprised that Mr. LEBEUF met his boyfriend on Tinder.

4 29. In or around early January 2017, Mr. LEBEUF found an apartment in Oakland
5 and moved to Oakland. Despite finding a home office in Oakland, Ms. Gregovich instructed Ms.
6 LEBEUF to continue to work out of the Ellie Mae Corporate Headquarters in the Pleasanton
7 office.

8 30. On or about January 10, 2016, Mr. LEBEUF informed Ms. Gregovich and a
9 human resources representative at the PGA, that due to his ADHD, he could not make phone
10 calls from the Ellie Mae Corporate Headquarters in the Pleasanton office. Mr. LEBEUF also
11 apprised Ms. Gregovich’s manager, Mr. Bo DeHuff, of his request for reasonable
12 accommodations.

13 31. In response to Mr. LEBEUF’s request for accommodation, he was chastised and
14 derided and never provided any alternative to the office conditions that were exacerbating his
15 disability.

16 32. On or about January 20, 2017, Mr. LEBEUF informed Ms. Gregovich that he was
17 traveling to see his partner. Later that same day, when someone else in the office asked what Mr.
18 LEBEUF was doing that weekend, Ms. Gregovich interrupted Mr. LEBEUF and responded for
19 him by stating that Mr. LEBEUF was going to see his family.

20 33. On or about January 20, 2017 right after the above-mentioned conversation, Ms.
21 Gregovich met with Mr. LEBEUF to inform him that he has thirty (30) days to sell one hundred
22 thousand dollars (\$100,000) of deals, which entailed a quarter of his sales quota goal for the
23 year, or be terminated.

24 34. By February 24, 2017, Mr. LEBEUF exceeded the sales quota goal set by Ms.
25 Gregovich on January 20, 2017.

26 35. On or about March 3, 2017, THE PGA terminated Mr. LEBEUF’s employment
27 for not being a “good fit”. When Mr. LEBEUF inquired why he was not a “good fit”, he was
28 provided no further information. On that date, THE PGA admitted that they owed him

1 commissions.

2 36. To date, Mr. LEBEUF has yet to receive several of the commission payments he
3 had earned. In addition, of the \$2,000 relocation allowance that THE PGA promised to pay Mr.
4 LEBEUF, THE PGA has only paid about \$1,400 of said allowance.

5 37. On February 23, 2018, Mr. LEBEUF filed a complaint with the California
6 Department of Fair Employment and Housing ("DFEH") and received an immediate "right to
7 sue" letter.

8 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **DISABILITY AND SEXUAL ORIENTATION DISCRIMINATION**
10 **IN VIOLATION OF GOVERNMENT CODE § 12940(a) ET SEQ. (FEHA)**
11 **(Against All Defendants)**

12 38. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations in
13 the foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth herein.

14 39. At all times mentioned in this complaint, DEFENDANTS regularly employed
15 five or more persons, bringing DEFENDANTS within the provisions of the California Fair
16 Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA"), Government Code, § 12926(d).

17 40. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the FEHA, Gov. Code, § 12940(a)
18 which prohibits an employer from discriminating against employees, such as Ms. LEBEUF, on
19 the basis of the employee's sexual orientation, disability and/or perceived disability.

20 41. Mr. LEBEUF was in a protected class as a qualified individual that limited his
21 major life activities. Specifically, but without limitation, Mr. LEBEUF suffered from anxiety and
22 attention deficit hyperactivity disorder ("ADHD"). As a result of his anxiety and ADHD
23 disorders, Mr. LEBEUF was disabled under Gov. Code §§ 12926 and 12926.1.

24 42. Mr. LEBEUF was in a protected class as a result of his sexual orientation as a gay
25 male.

26 43. DEFENDANTS engaged in a pattern and practice of discriminating against
27 employees, including Mr. LEBEUF, and did discriminate against Mr. LEBEUF, on the basis of
28 disability and/or sexual orientation, in compensation and conditions or privileges of employment,

JML LAW
A Professional Law Corporation
21052 Ornard Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 610-8800

1 ultimately resulting in the wrongful termination of Mr. LEBEUF. But for Mr. LEBEUF's sexual
2 orientation and/or disability, DEFENDANTS would not have taken adverse employment actions
3 against him, including termination of his employment.

4 44. Mr. LEBEUF timely filed charges of discrimination and received Notices of Right
5 to Sue from the DFEH. Thus, Ms. LEBEUF has exhausted his administrative remedies.

6 45. As the legal result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, Mr. LEBEUF has suffered and
7 continues to suffer substantial losses of wages, salary, benefits and additional amounts of money
8 that Mr. LEBEUF would have received if DEFENDANTS had not discriminated against him as
9 alleged above. Mr. LEBEUF has further suffered and continues to suffer losses incurred in
10 seeking substitute employment and earnings. As a result of such discrimination and consequent
11 harm, Mr. LEBEUF has suffered such damages in an amount according to proof. Mr. LEBEUF
12 claims such amounts as damages pursuant to California Civil Code § 3287 and/or §3288 and/or
13 any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest.

14 46. As the further legal result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, Mr. LEBEUF has suffered
15 and continues to suffer embarrassment, anxiety, humiliation and emotional distress, all to his
16 damage in an amount according to proof.

17 47. As the further legal result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, Mr. LEBEUF has been
18 harmed in that he has suffered the intangible loss of such employment-related opportunities as
19 experience and status in the positions previously held by him, all to his damage in an amount
20 according to proof.

21 48. The above-cited conduct of DEFENDANTS was done with malice, fraud and
22 oppression, and in reckless disregard of Mr. LEBEUF's rights under the FEHA. DEFENDANTS
23 consciously, intentionally and in conscious disregard of his rights discriminated against Mr.
24 LEBEUF because of his sexual orientation, disability and/or perceived disability. Mr. LEBEUF
25 is thus entitled to recover punitive damages from DEFENDANTS in an amount according to
26 proof.

27 49. As the result of DEFENDANTS' discriminatory acts as alleged herein, Mr.
28 LEBEUF is entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit as provided by FEHA, Gov.

JML LAW
A Professional Law Corporation
21052 Oxnard Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 610-8800

1 Code § 12965(b).

2 WHEREFORE, Mr. LEBEUF requests relief as hereinafter provided.

3 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **FAILURE TO ACCOMMODATE**

5 **IN VIOLATION OF GOVERNMENT CODE § 12940(m) ET SEQ. (FEHA)**

6 **(Against All Defendants)**

7 50. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations in
8 the foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth herein.

9 51. At all times mentioned in this complaint, DEFENDANTS regularly employed
10 five or more persons, bringing DEFENDANTS within the provisions of the FEHA, Gov. Code, §
11 12926(d).

12 52. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the FEHA, Gov. Code, § 12940(m)
13 requiring employers to make reasonable accommodation for disabilities of employees, such as
14 Mr. LEBEUF's disability.

15 53. Mr. LEBEUF was afflicted with anxiety and ADHD disorders, which are
16 protected under the FEHA. As a result of these conditions, Mr. LEBEUF required reasonable
17 accommodations to fully perform the duties of his job with DEFENDANTS. DEFENDANTS,
18 however, refused to reasonably accommodate Mr. LEBEUF, although DEFENDANTS easily
19 could have done so.

20 54. Mr. LEBEUF timely filed a charge of discrimination and received a Notice of
21 Right to Sue from the DFEH. Thus, Mr. LEBEUF has exhausted his administrative remedies.

22 55. As the legal result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, Mr. LEBEUF has suffered and
23 continues to suffer substantial losses of wages, salary, benefits and additional amounts of money
24 that Mr. LEBEUF would have received if DEFENDANTS had not discriminated against him and
25 refused to accommodate him as alleged above. As a result of such discrimination and failure to
26 accommodate and consequent harm, Mr. LEBEUF has suffered such damages in an amount
27 according to proof. Mr. LEBEUF claims such amounts as damages pursuant to California Civil
28 Code § 3287 and/or §3288 and/or any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest.

JML LAW
A Professional Law Corporation
21052 Oxnard Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 610-8800

56. As the further legal result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, Mr. LEBEUF has suffered and continues to suffer embarrassment, anxiety, humiliation and emotional distress, all to his damage in an amount according to proof.

57. As the further legal result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, Mr. LEBEUF has been harmed in that he has suffered the intangible loss of such employment-related opportunities as experience and status in the positions previously held by him, all to his damage in an amount according to proof.

58. The above-cited conduct of DEFENDANTS was done with malice, fraud and oppression, and in reckless disregard of Mr. LEBEUF's rights under the FEHA. DEFENDANTS consciously, intentionally and in conscious disregard of his rights discriminated against Mr. LEBEUF by refusing to reasonably accommodate his disability. Mr. LEBEUF is thus entitled to recover punitive damages from DEFENDANTS in an amount according to proof.

59. As the result of DEFENDANTS' discriminatory acts as alleged herein, Mr. LEBEUF is entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit as provided by California Government Code section 12965(b).

60. WHEREFORE, Mr. LEBEUF requests relief as hereinafter provided.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO ENGAGE IN THE INTERACTIVE PROCESS IN VIOLATION OF GOVERNMENT CODE § 12940(n) ET SEQ. (FEHA) (Against All Defendants)

61. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations in the foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth herein.

62. At all times mentioned in this complaint, DEFENDANTS regularly employed five or more persons, bringing DEFENDANTS within the provisions of the FEHA, Gov. Code, § 12926(d).

63. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the FEHA, Gov. Code, § 12940(n) prohibiting employers from refusing to engage in a timely, good faith interactive process.

64. Mr. LEBEUF was afflicted with anxiety and ADHD disorders, which are

JML LAW
A Professional Law Corporation
21052 Ormand Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 610-8800

1 protected under the FEHA. As a result of Mr. LEBEUF's disabilities, he required reasonable
2 accommodations to fully perform the duties of his job with DEFENDANTS. DEFENDANTS,
3 however, refused to reasonably accommodate Mr. LEBEUF although DEFENDANTS easily
4 could have done so.

5 65. Moreover, in rejecting Mr. LEBEUF's request for accommodation and/or refusing
6 to accommodate Mr. LEBEUF, DEFENDANTS failed to engage in a timely, good faith
7 interactive process with Mr. LEBEUF to determine effective reasonable accommodations.

8 66. Mr. LEBEUF timely filed a charge of discrimination and received a Notice of
9 Right to Sue from the DFEH. Thus, Mr. LEBEUF has exhausted his administrative remedies.

10 67. As the legal result of DEFENDANT'S' conduct, Mr. LEBEUF has suffered and
11 continues to suffer substantial losses of wages, salary, benefits and additional amounts of money
12 that Mr. LEBEUF would have received if DEFENDANTS had not discriminated against him,
13 had reasonably accommodated him, and/or had engaged in the interactive process as alleged
14 above. As a result of DEFENDANTS' actions and consequent harm, Mr. LEBEUF has suffered
15 such damages in an amount according to proof. Mr. LEBEUF claims such amounts as damages
16 pursuant to California Civil Code § 3287 and/or §3288 and/or any other provision of law
17 providing for prejudgment interest.

18 68. As the further legal result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, Mr. LEBEUF has suffered
19 and continues to suffer embarrassment, anxiety, humiliation and emotional distress, all to his
20 damage in an amount according to proof.

21 69. As the further legal result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, Mr. LEBEUF has been
22 harmed in that he has suffered the intangible loss of such employment-related opportunities as
23 experience and status in the positions previously held by him, to his damage in an amount
24 according to proof.

25 70. The above-cited conduct of DEFENDANTS was done with malice, fraud and
26 oppression, and in reckless disregard of Mr. LEBEUF's rights under the FEHA. DEFENDANTS
27 consciously, intentionally and in conscious disregard of his rights discriminated against Mr.
28 LEBEUF by refusing to engage in a timely, good faith interactive process. Mr. LEBEUF is thus

JML LAW
A Professional Law Corporation
21052 Oxnard Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 610-8800

1 entitled to recover punitive damages from DEFENDANTS in an amount according to proof.
2 71. As the result of DEFENDANTS acts as alleged herein, Mr. LEBEUF is entitled to
3 reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit as provided by California Government Code §
4 12965(b).

5 WHEREFORE, Mr. LEBEUF requests relief as hereinafter provided.

6 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **RETALIATION**

8 **IN VIOLATION OF GOVERNMENT CODE § 12940(h) ET SEQ. (FEHA)**

9 **(Against All Defendants)**

10 72. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations in
11 the foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth herein.

12 73. At all times mentioned in this complaint, DEFENDANTS regularly employed
13 five or more persons, bringing DEFENDANT S within the provisions of the FEHA, Gov. Code,
14 § 12926(d).

15 74. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the FEHA, Gov. Code, § 12940(h)
16 preventing DEFENDANTS from discharging or otherwise discriminating against any employee,
17 such as Mr. LEBEUF, for exercising rights protected under the FEHA.

18 75. DEFENDANTS engaged in a pattern and practice of retaliating against
19 employees, including Mr. LEBEUF, for exercising protected rights. DEFENDANTS' adverse
20 actions, including, but not limited to, termination, and failure to accommodate, were at least in
21 part, in retaliation for Mr. LEBEUF suffering a disability and/or requesting reasonable
22 accommodation for his disability.

23 76. Mr. LEBEUF timely filed a charge of discrimination and received a Notice of
24 Right to Sue from the DFEH. Thus, Mr. LEBEUF has exhausted his administrative remedies.

25 77. As the legal result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, Mr. LEBEUF has suffered and
26 continues to suffer substantial losses of wages, salary, benefits and additional amounts of money
27 that Mr. LEBEUF would have received if DEFENDANTS had not retaliated against him as
28 alleged above. As a result of DEFENDANTS' actions and consequent harm, Mr. LEBEUF has

JML LAW
A Professional Law Corporation
21052 Oxnard Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 610-8800

1 suffered such damages in an amount according to proof. Mr. LEBEUF claims such amounts as
2 damages pursuant to California Civil Code § 3287 and/or §3288 and/or any other provision of
3 law providing for prejudgment interest.

4 78. As the further legal result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, Mr. LEBEUF has suffered
5 and continues to suffer embarrassment, anxiety, humiliation and emotional distress, all to his
6 damage in an amount according to proof.

7 79. As the further legal result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, Mr. LEBEUF has been
8 harmed in that he has suffered the intangible loss of such employment-related opportunities as
9 experience and status in the positions previously held by him, those he would have held, all to
10 his damage in an amount according to proof.

11 80. The above-cited conduct of DEFENDANTS was done with malice, fraud and
12 oppression, and in reckless disregard of Mr. LEBEUF's rights under the FEHA. DEFENDANTS
13 consciously, intentionally and in conscious disregard of his rights retaliated against Mr.
14 LEBEUF. Mr. LEBEUF is thus entitled to recover punitive damages from DEFENDANTS in an
15 amount according to proof.

16 81. As the result of DEFENDANTS' discriminatory and retaliatory acts as alleged
17 herein, Mr. LEBEUF is entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit as provided by
18 California Government Code, section 12965(b).

19 WHEREFORE, Mr. LEBEUF requests relief as hereinafter provided.

20 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **FAILURE TO PREVENT DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION**

22 **IN VIOLATION OF GOVERNMENT CODE § 12940(k) (FEHA)**

23 **(Against All Defendants)**

24 82. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations in
25 the foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth herein.

26 83. At all times mentioned in this complaint, DEFENDANTS regularly employed
27 five or more persons, bringing DEFENDANTS within the provisions of the FEHA, Gov. Code, §
28 12926(d).

JML LAW
A Professional Law Corporation
21052 Ornard Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 610-8800

84. DEFENDANTS violated the FEHA, Gov. Code § 12940(k) by, among other things, failing to take all reasonable steps to prevent discrimination from occurring, and failing to promptly and effectively investigate and remediate complaints of discrimination, retaliation and failure to accommodate. Mr. LEBEUF requested reasonable accommodations for his disability. DEFENDANTS' employees denied his requests and, instead, terminated Mr. LEBEUF's employment. To Mr. LEBEUF's knowledge, DEFENDANTS failed to express disapproval of its employees' behaviors and failed to take any meaningful or adequate disciplinary action against these employees.

85. The response of DEFENDANTS to Mr. LEBEUF's requests was so inadequate as to establish a deliberate indifference to, or tacit authorization of, the alleged offensive acts, and a causal link existed between DEFENDANTS' lack of reasonable actions and the injuries suffered by Mr. LEBEUF.

86. Mr. LEBEUF timely filed a charge of discrimination and received a Notice of Right to Sue from the DFEH. Thus, Mr. LEBEUF has exhausted his administrative remedies.

87. As the legal result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, Mr. LEBEUF has suffered and continues to suffer substantial losses of wages, salary, benefits and additional amounts of money that Mr. LEBEUF would have received if DEFENDANTS had not acted unlawfully as alleged above. As a result of such actions and consequent harm, Mr. LEBEUF has suffered such damages in an amount according to proof. Mr. LEBEUF claims such amounts as damages pursuant to California Civil Code § 3287 and/or §3288 and/or any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest.

88. As the further legal result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, Mr. LEBEUF has suffered and continues to suffer embarrassment, anxiety, humiliation and emotional distress, all to his damage in an amount according to proof.

89. As the further legal result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, Mr. LEBEUF has been harmed in that he has suffered the intangible loss of such employment-related opportunities as experience and status in the positions previously held by him, all to his damage in an amount according to proof.

1 90. The above-cited conduct of DEFENDANTS was done with malice, fraud and
2 oppression, and in reckless disregard of Mr. LEBEUF's rights under the FEHA. DEFENDANTS
3 consciously, intentionally and in conscious disregard of his rights failed to take reasonable steps
4 to prevent discrimination and/or retaliation. Mr. LEBEUF is thus entitled to recover punitive
5 damages from DEFENDANTS in an amount according to proof.

6 91. As the result of DEFENDANTS' unlawful acts as alleged herein, Mr. LEBEUF is
7 entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit as provided by FEHA, Gov. Code, §
8 12965(b).

9 WHEREFORE, Mr. LEBEUF requests relief as hereinafter provided.

10 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **WRONGFUL TERMINATION IN VIOLATION OF PUBLIC POLICY**

12 **(Against All Defendants)**

13 92. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations in
14 the foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth herein.

15 93. At all times mentioned, the public policy of the State of California, as codified,
16 expressed and mandated in California Government Code § 12940, is to prohibit employers from
17 discriminating, harassing and retaliating against any individual on the basis of, but not limited to,
18 sexual orientation and disability as identified in California Government Code § 12940 (a)-(o).
19 This public policy of the State of California is designed to protect all employees and to promote
20 the welfare and well being of the community at large.

21 94. Accordingly, the actions of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, in terminating Mr.
22 LEBEUF on the grounds alleged and described herein were wrongful and in contravention of the
23 express public policy of the State of California, to wit, the policy set forth in California
24 Government Code § 12940 et seq., and the laws and regulations promulgated thereunder.

25 95. As a proximate result of the aforesaid acts of DEFENDANTS, Mr. LEBEUF has
26 suffered actual, consequential and incidental financial losses, including without limitation, loss
27 of salary and benefits, and the intangible loss of employment related opportunities in his field
28 and damage to his professional reputation, all in an amount subject to proof at the time of trial.

JML LAW
A Professional Law Corporation
21052 Oxnard Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 610-8800

1 Mr. LEBEUF claims such amounts as damages pursuant to California Civil Code § 3287 and/or
2 § 3288 and/or any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest.

3 96. As a proximate result of the wrongful acts of DEFENDANTS, Mr. LEBEUF has
4 suffered and continues to suffer stress, anxiety, depression, humiliation, and emotional trauma.
5 Mr. LEBEUF is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that he will continue to
6 experience said physical and emotional suffering for a period in the future not presently
7 ascertainable, all in an amount subject to proof at the time of trial.

8 97. As a proximate result of the wrongful acts of DEFENDANTS, Mr. LEBEUF has
9 been forced to hire attorneys to prosecute his claims herein, and has incurred and is expected to
10 continue to incur attorneys' fees and costs in connection therewith. Mr. LEBEUF is entitled to
11 recover attorneys' fees and costs under California Government Code § 12965(b).

12 98. DEFENDANTS had in place policies and procedures that specifically required
13 DEFENDANTS' managers officers and agents to prevent discrimination, retaliation and
14 harassment against and upon employees of DEFENDANTS, based on the protected classes
15 identified in the FEHA, Government Code § 12940 *et. seq.* DEFENDANTS' managers, officers
16 and/or agents of DEFENDANTS were aware of DEFENDANTS' policies and procedures
17 requiring DEFENDANTS' managers, officers and agents to prevent and investigate
18 discrimination and retaliation based on disability and sexual orientation, against and upon
19 employees of DEFENDANTS. Mr. LEBEUF relied on the fact that managers, officers and
20 agents would follow these known policies; yet, the managers, officers and agents consciously
21 chose not to follow these policies. Therefore, their outrageous conduct was fraudulent, malicious,
22 oppressive, and was done in wanton disregard for the rights of Mr. LEBEUF and the rights and
23 duties owed by each of the DEFENDANTS to Mr. LEBEUF. Each DEFENDANT aided,
24 abetted, participated in, authorized, ratified, and/or conspired to engage in the wrongful conduct
25 alleged above. Mr. LEBEUF should, therefore, be awarded exemplary and punitive damages
26 against each DEFENDANT in an amount to be established that is appropriate to punish each
27 DEFENDANT and deter others from engaging in such conduct.

28 WHEREFORE, Mr. LEBEUF requests relief as hereinafter provided.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**FRAUDULENT INDUCEMENT TO MOVE IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 970****(Against All Defendants)**

99. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations in the foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth herein.

100. Mr. LEBEUF pleads this cause of action against DEFENDANTS for fraudulent inducement to move in violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 970. DEFENDANTS fraudulently induced Mr. LEBEUF to accept employment with DEFENDANTS in or around October 31, 2016, moving from Florida to California based upon misrepresentations (false promises) and concealment about the (a) the kind and character of his work, including that he would be primarily working from home, (b) reimbursement of moving and housing expenses, (c) tuition reimbursements for his masters program and (d) the length of time such work would last as Mr. LEBEUF understood that his employment with THE PGA, barring unexpected circumstances, would last longer than the 4 months that it did.

101. DEFENDANTS knew that Mr. LEBEUF was justifiably relying on what DEFENDANTS told Mr. LEBEUF regarding the kind and character of the work, reimbursement of his hotel and moving expenses, tuition reimbursement for pursuing his master's education and the length of time that work would be available and knew that Mr. LEBEUF would have acted differently if he was told otherwise.

102. Mr. LEBEUF is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the above referenced fraudulent representations made by DEFENDANTS were knowingly made to Mr. LEBEUF to induce him to accept employment with DEFENDANTS.

103. Mr. LEBEUF, acting in justifiable reliance upon the truth of the representations made by each of the DEFENDANTS, accepted employment with THE PGA with the expectation that he would be reimbursed for \$2000 of his moving expenses, completely reimbursed for his hotel expenses while searching for a home office, reimbursed for pursuing his masters program after 60 days of working, working from home in an environment promised to him from his home office and, to the extent that practices at THE PGA were below standard practices, that

JML LAW
A Professional Law Corporation
21052 Oxnard Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 610-8800

1 DEFENDANTS would diligently attempt to correct these problems based upon its legal
2 obligation to do so. Had these false promises and concealment by DEFENDANTS not been
3 made to Mr. LEBEUF, he would not have accepted employment with DEFENDANTS.
4 Defendants willfully concealed and suppressed these materials facts concerning Mr. LEBEUF's
5 employment. In doing so, DEFENDANTS acted with the intent to defraud and to induce Mr.
6 LEBEUF into accepting the position with DEFENDANTS. DEFENDANTS knew or should
7 have known that Mr. LEBEUF would not have accepted the offer of employment had he not
8 been made these false promises.

9 104. Mr. LEBEUF was unaware of the falsity of these representations and acted in
10 reliance upon the truth of the representations made to him and was justified in relying upon these
11 representations.

12 105. DEFENDANTS committed unlawful employment acts, including but not limited
13 to: (a) a pattern, policy, and practice of fraudulent inducement and deceit in its hiring practices,
14 and (b) defrauding Mr. LEBEUF into accepting employment and entering into an employment
15 agreement based upon false representations.

16 106. By the use of such practices and tactics against Mr. LEBEUF, DEFENDANTS
17 and each of them, deprived Plaintiff of the benefits of his employment agreement.

18 107. Each of the representations made by DEFENDANTS to Mr. LEBEUF were
19 fabricated, false, and made to induce Mr. LEBEUF to accept employment with DEFENDANTS.
20 These representations were made with the intent to cause Mr. LEBEUF to rely on them with the
21 express intent to deceive and to induce him to enter into an employment agreement with
22 DEFENDANTS.

23 108. As a proximate result of DEFENDANTS' fraudulent inducement of Mr.
24 LEBEUF, he has been harmed including general damages and special damages of wage loss.

25 109. Mr. LEBEUF is informed and believes and therein alleges that the aforesaid acts
26 directed toward him were carried out by managing agents of DEFENDANTS with a conscious
27 disregard of his right to be free from such illegal behavior, such as to constitute oppression,
28 fraud, or malice pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 3294, entitling Mr. LEBEUF to punitive damages

1 in an amount appropriate to punish and set an example of DEFENDANTS.

2 WHEREFORE, Mr. LEBEUF requests relief as hereinafter provided.

3 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **PROMISSORY FRAUD**

5 **(Against All Defendants)**

6 110. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations in
7 the foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth herein.

8 111. DEFENDANTS promised employment to Mr. LEBEUF, specifically a position
9 where he would be working from his home office with some work at THE PGA's Hayward
10 office, payment of \$2,000 in relocation allowance, hotel expenses reimbursement until he found
11 a home office in January 2017, and reimbursement for tuition to pursue his masters program.

12 112. DEFENDANTS did not intend to perform the aforementioned promises when
13 they made it, but intended to place Mr. LEBEUF in its sponsor's Pleasanton office, only
14 reimburse a portion of his relocation allowance and hotel expenses and not allow him to pursue
15 his masters program.

16 113. DEFENDANTS intended that PLAINTIFF rely on these promises.

17 114. PLAINTIFF was harmed as a result of his change of position.

18 115. PLAINTIFF reasonably relied on DEFENDANTS' promises by incurring
19 expenditures, abandoning his masters program, relocating, and entering into a lease.

20 116. DEFENDANTS forced PLAINTIFF to work out of its sponsor's Pleasanton
21 office, failed to pay the promised \$2,000 in relocation expenses, failed to reimburse all of his
22 hotel expenses until he located a home office in January 2017 and disallowed him from pursuing
23 his masters program. Thereafter, DEFENDANTS terminated Mr. LEBEUF and thus did not
24 perform the promises made to him to induce him to accept employment with the PGA and move
25 to California.

26 117. Mr. LEBEUF was harmed.

27 118. Mr. LEBEUF's reliance on DEFENDANTS' promises was a substantial factor in
28 causing his harm.

1 119. Mr. LEBEUF is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the aforesaid acts
2 directed toward him were carried out with a conscious disregard of his right to be free from such
3 illegal behavior, such as to constitute oppression, fraud, or malice pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code §
4 3294, entitling Mr. LEBEUF to punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish and set an
5 example of DEFENDANTS.

6 WHEREFORE, Mr. LEBEUF requests relief as hereinafter provided.

7 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES**

9 **IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 2802**

10 **(Against All Defendants)**

11 120. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations in
12 the foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth herein.

13 121. California Labor Code § 2802 provides that employers shall reimburse employees
14 for all expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

15 122. DEFENDANTS required Mr. LEBEUF to move to California and promised to
16 pay him his hotel expenses while he searched and located a home office by January 2017 and to
17 pay him a moving allowance of \$2,000 in order for Mr. LEBEUF to conduct business for THE
18 PGA and perform his job functions.

19 123. As a result of moving to California pursuant to THE PGA's requirement to
20 perform his job functions for DEFENDANTS, Mr. LEBEUF incurred expenses for his hotel
21 accommodations that were not entirely paid by THE PGA. Instead of reimbursing all of his hotel
22 expenses as previously promised as set forth, inter alia, THE PGA required Mr. LEBEUF to pay
23 \$1,500 for said hotel expenses.

24 124. As a result of moving to California pursuant to THE PGA's requirement to
25 perform his job functions for DEFENDANTS, Mr. LEBEUF incurred moving expenses
26 exceeding \$7,000. Instead of paying the \$2,000 relocation allowance that was promised in his
27 offer letter, THE PGA only paid about \$1,400 for Mr. LEBEUF's moving expenses.

28 125. DEFENDANTS intentionally and consistently failed to reimburse Mr. LEBEUF

1 for expenses incurred in the performance of his duties, in violation of Labor Code § 2802.

2 126. Mr. LEBEUF is entitled to the full amount of expenses he incurred, plus interest,
3 and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit in accordance with Labor Code § 2802.

4 WHEREFORE, Mr. LEBEUF requests relief as hereinafter provided.

5 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §§ 510 & 1194**

7 **(Against All Defendants)**

8 127. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations in
9 the foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth herein.

10 128. California Labor Code § 510 requires employers to pay employees one and one-
11 half (1 ½) times the regular rate of all those hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one
12 workday and in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek, and for the first eight (8) hours
13 worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek.

14 129. California Labor Code § 1194 entitles an employee receiving less than the legal
15 overtime compensation to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of all
16 overtime wages owed, including interest thereon, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

17 130. Throughout Mr. LEBEUF's employment with DEFENDANTS, DEFENDANTS
18 required Mr. LEBEUF to work overtime, including evenings. As a result, Mr. LEBEUF worked
19 more than eight (8) hours in one workday and in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek.

20 131. DEFENDANTS failed to pay Mr. LEBEUF the overtime compensation earned
21 during his employment with DEFENDANTS.

22 132. As a proximate result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, Mr. LEBEUF has been
23 deprived of overtime compensation in an amount to be determined at trial and is entitled to the
24 recovery of such amounts, including interest, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

25 133. Based on DEFENDANTS' conduct as alleged above, DEFENDANTS are liable
26 for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 558.

27 WHEREFORE, Mr. LEBEUF requests relief as hereinafter provided.

28 //

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY MEAL PERIODS

IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §§ 226.7 & 512

(Against All Defendants)

134. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations in the foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth herein.

135. At all relevant times, DEFENDANTS had a policy and/or practice of not permitting or authorizing employees to take a thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal period. PLAINTIFF regularly worked in excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours a day without being provided at least a half-hour meal period in which he was relieved of all duties, as required by Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512 and IWC Wage Orders.

136. At all relevant times, DEFENDANTS willfully required Mr. LEBEUF to work during meal periods, and failed to compensate Mr. LEBEUF for work performed during meal periods. DEFENDANTS improperly classified Mr. LEBEUF as "exempt" and on that basis took no measures to provide them meal period breaks. DEFENDANTS also had no policy and/or practice to pay a premium when meal periods were missed, as a result of misclassifying Mr. LEBEUF as exempt, and thus failed to pay Mr. LEBEUF the full meal period premiums due.

137. DEFENDANTS' policy and practice described above renders them liable to Mr. LEBEUF for one hour of additional pay at the regular rate of compensation for each workday that the proper meal period was not permitted or authorized, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, as well as interest on that amount pursuant to Labor Code § 218.6, plus reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

WHEREFORE, Mr. LEBEUF requests relief as hereinafter provided.

///

///

///

///

///

JML LAW
A Professional Law Corporation
21052 Oxnard Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 610-8800

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
FAILURE TO PAY REST PERIODS BREAKS
IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §§ 226.7

(Against All Defendants)

138. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations in the foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth herein.

139. At all relevant times, DEFENDANTS had a policy and/or practice of not permitting or authorizing Mr. LEBEUF to take a ten (10) minute rest period for every four (4) hours of work or major fraction thereof as required by Labor Code §§ 226.7 and IWC Wage Orders.

140. At all relevant times, Mr. LEBEUF regularly worked in excess of three and one-half (3 ½) hours, six (6) hours and at times ten (10) hours a day without being provided a ten (10) minute rest period.

141. DEFENDANTS' policy and practice described above renders them liable to Mr. LEBEUF for one hour of additional pay at the regular rate of compensation for each workday that the proper rest period was not permitted or authorized, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, as well as interest on that amount pursuant to Labor Code § 218.6, plus reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

WHEREFORE, Mr. LEBEUF requests relief as hereinafter provided.

THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
FAILURE TO PROVIDE TIMELY AND ACCURATE WAGE STATEMENTS
IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 226

(Against All Defendants)

142. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations in the foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth herein.

143. California Labor Code § 226 requires an employer to provide an accurate itemized statement in writing showing "(1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is

JML LAW
 A Professional Law Corporation
 21052 Oxnard Street
 Woodland Hills, CA 91367
 (818) 610-8800

1 exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order
 2 of the Industrial Welfare Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any
 3 applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided
 4 that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one
 5 item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
 6 (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or
 7 an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address
 8 of the legal entity that is the employer..."

9 144. Labor Code § 226(e) provides that if an employer knowingly and intentionally
 10 fails to provide a statement in compliance with Labor Code § 226(a), then the employee is
 11 entitled to recover the greater of actual damages of fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial violation and
 12 one hundred dollars (\$100) for each subsequent violation, up to four thousand dollars (\$4,000).

13 145. DEFENDANTS knowingly and intentionally failed to furnish Mr. LEBEUF with
 14 timely accurate and itemized wage statements as required by Labor Code § 226. Accordingly,
 15 Mr. LEBEUF is entitled to the amounts provided by Labor Code § 226(e), injunctive relief
 16 requiring DEFENDANTS' compliance with Labor Code § 226, as well as his attorneys' fees and
 17 costs pursuant to Labor Code § 226(h) and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

18 WHEREFORE, Mr. LEBEUF requests relief as hereinafter provided.

19 **FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **FAILURE TO PAY WAGES UPON TERMINATION**

21 **IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §§ 201, 202, 203 & 204**

22 **(Against All Defendants)**

23 146. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations in
 24 the foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth herein.

25 147. California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 require Defendants to pay all
 26 compensation due and owing immediately at the time of discharge, layoff, or resignation made
 27 with at least seventy-two (72) hours' notice, or within seventy-two (72) hours of resignation
 28 made without seventy-two (72) hours' notice.

JML LAW
A Professional Law Corporation
21052 Ornard Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 610-8800

1 148. California Labor Code § 204 requires an employer to pay all wages owed at least
2 semimonthly. Due and owing to DEFENDANTS' failure to provide premium pay to
3 PLAINTIFF for not providing his meal and rest breaks as alleged herein, DEFENDANTS have
4 failed to provide all wages owed at the time they are due.

5 149. DEFENDANTS' conduct described in this Complaint violates, among other
6 things, Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and 204; and also the provisions of Cal. Lab. Code § 1194
7 and 1197.1 which provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without payment for all hours
8 worked.

9 150. As of the date of the filing of this Complaint, DEFENDANTS have willfully
10 failed to pay Mr. LEBEUF all compensation earned, including but not limited to overtime pay,
11 commissions and meal and rest period penalties.

12 151. Although Mr. LEBEUF has demanded payment for his commissions in particular,
13 DEFENDANTS have refused and continue to refuse to pay Mr. LEBEUF the amount due and
14 owing Mr. LEBEUF for his commissions.

15 152. Since the date of Mr. LEBEUF's termination from employment with
16 DEFENDANTS, Mr. LEBEUF has been available and ready to receive the amount of wages due
17 and owing to Mr. LEBEUF. Mr. LEBEUF has not refused to receive any payment, nor has Mr.
18 LEBEUF been absent from his regular place of residence.

19 153. DEFENDANTS' willful failure to pay Mr. LEBEUF the wages due and owing
20 Mr. LEBEUF as set forth above constitutes a violation of Labor Code §203, which provides that
21 an employee's wages will continue as a penalty until paid up to thirty (30) days from the time the
22 wages were due. Therefore, Mr. LEBEUF is entitled to penalties to the maximum amount
23 afforded to him at his daily wage rate for thirty (30) days.

24 154. As the result of DEFENDANTS' failure to pay Mr. LEBEUF the wages due and
25 owing to him acts as alleged herein, he is entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit
26 as provided by Labor Code §218.5.

27 WHEREFORE, Mr. LEBEUF requests relief as hereinafter provided.

28 //

FIFTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**VIOLATION OF UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES/ UNFAIR COMPETITION ACT –
BUS. & PROF. CODE §17200 ET SEQ.**

(Against All Defendants)

155. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates herein by this reference the allegations in the foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth herein.

156. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq., prohibits businesses from engaging in unlawful, unfair or deceptive business practices. Defendants' illegal policies and/or practices described herein constitute unlawful acts prohibited by employment and business and professions laws and regulations. California's Unfair Competition Law also provides for injunctive relief and restitution for violations.

157. DEFENDANTS have committed numerous unfair, unlawful, or deceptive business practices including: (1) failing to pay PLAINTIFF overtime as required by law; (2) failing to relieve PLAINTIFF of all duties to allow for a thirty minute uninterrupted meal break and requiring PLAINTIFF to work without rest breaks; (3) failing to provide PLAINTIFF an accurate itemized wage statement for each pay period as required by law; (4) failing to pay all wages owed at least semimonthly to PLAINTIFF; (5) willfully failing to pay compensation owing (including unpaid wages) in a prompt and timely manner to PLAINTIFF whose employment with DEFENDANTS was terminated; (6) failing to reimburse business expenses; (7) discriminating, failing to reasonably accommodate and engage in the interactive process and retaliating against PLAINTIFF in violation of Cal. Gov. Code §12940 et seq. and (8) fraudulently inducing PLAINTIFF to move to accept a position with Defendants.

158. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon alleges that DEFENDANTS continue to engage in the practices described herein and is continuing and will continue to benefit financially from these unlawful and unfair practices unless enjoined by this court from doing so.

159. As a proximate result of DEFENDANTS' actions, Mr. LEBEUF has suffered injury in fact and lost money or property pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17204.

1 other injunctive relief as the Court may deem proper;

2 7. For prejudgment interest at the prevailing legal rate on all amounts claimed;

3 8. For costs of suit, including reasonable attorneys' fees and expert costs; and

4 9. For any other and further relief that the court considers proper.

5

6

7 DATED: March 1, 2018

JML LAW, A Professional Law Corporation

8

9

10

By:



11

JOSEPH M. LOVRETOVICH

12

MYTHILY SIVARAJAH

13

Attorneys for Plaintiff

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

JML LAW
A Professional Law Corporation
21052 Oxnard Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 610-8800